

**REMARKS**

In response to the objection to the drawings set forth in paragraph 1 of the Office Action,, new drawings are being presented with this Amendment. The drawings have been prepared so that they are replacement sheets for each of the original drawings. For this reason, it is requested that the objection to the drawings be withdraw.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the expression "...a longer band element having a length larger than that of an imaginary vertical band element ..." as being new matter.

The slanted arrangement of the band-elements, which can be coupled to the surface of the cylindric body 11 by any suitable coupling means and allows for the use of a longer slanted band element 12 having a length larger than that of a vertical band element 1 arranged vertically, that is in a direction parallel to the vertical axis of the cylindric ring element.

This is shown in figure 1, where the vertical element (the canceled "imaginary" vertical element) is shown by the reference number 1, whereas the inventive longer band element has now been shown in several figures, by the reference element 12.

Since the element that was the basis of the rejection has been canceled, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 4 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner stated that previous claim 4, lines 24-28 contains

subject matter that has not been originally disclosed in the disclosure. In particular, the Examiner objects the words "...that each said band element has a length larger by substantially 25% than a length of an imaginary like band element arranged in a direction parallel to said central longitudinal axis of said cylindric ring body".

Applicant does not agree with this statement of the Examiner.

In fact, on the lines 2 and 3 of page 6 of the specification, it is stated that "according to a preferred inclination, the band element has in average a 25% larger length". These words are referred to the last paragraph of page 5, on which is stated "Moreover, the slanted arrangement of the bristle, which can be coupled to the cylindric body 11 by any suitable coupling means, allows to provide a longer band element having a length larger than that of the band element arranged in a direction parallel to the axis (that is in the vertical direction)".

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the words "...that each said band element has a length larger by substantially 25% than a length of a "vertical" like band element arranged in a direction parallel to the central longitudinal axis (that is the vertical axis) of the cylindric body" do not represent new matter.

With respect to the assertion of the Examiner that the disclosure does not state that adjoining band elements of different colors create a colored spiral, actually the disclosure does not state that "each" of the band elements has a different color, but on page 6, lines 29 to 32 states that "Moreover, the color spiral obtained by adjoining different colors on the

band elements would be perfectly arranged, with respect to its epicycloidal pattern".

It is respectfully submitted that these words mean that the band elements are provided adjoining different colors which, on the other hand, could not be shown in the drawings since the drawings are black and white drawings.

In drafting new claim 6, care has been put to avoid the basis of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Applicant has noted that previous claim 4, now substantially corresponding to new claim 6, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by JP 2002-316622 (the Japanese patent). In connection with this rejection, the Examiner stated that the Japanese patent disclosed the claimed invention including a washing brush element comprising a cylindric ring body having a central longitudinal axis.

Reconsideration is requested

Applicant does not agree with this assertion of the Examiner. In fact, the Japanese patent does not disclose a washing brush element designed to be axially coupled to a plurality of like washing brush elements for making a washing brush assembly. In fact, the Japanese patent discloses a washing brush assembly which is not a module for forming a larger brush assembly. In other words, the prior document discloses an already constructed brush assembly which is not made by coupling onto one another, that is in an overlapping relationship with "a plurality of like washing brush elements ....each said washing brush element comprising a cylindric ring body" as pointed

out in new claim 6.

The Examiner also stated that on a side cylindric outer surface of the prior brush assembly would be defined a plurality of adjoining seats (each adjoining seat in the region having the reference number 10 in figure 3).

Applicant does not agree with this assertion because reference character 10 does not indicate seats but indicates a presser-foot board 10 which polymerizes in the surface side. Applicant respectfully points out that the prior cylindric body of the washing brush would comprise thereon a further presser-foot board 10 which polymerizes but does not comprise seats.

New claim 6 points out that the seats are diagonally separated clockwise slanted U-shape seats. On the contrary, in the Japanese patent, the "seats" which actually are absent, are not U-shaped, and are not diagonally separated but rather they are on the surface of the board 10 and not on the cylindric core of the washing brush in a continuous arrangement. Moreover, the continuous seat arrangement (actually no seat is disclosed in the Japanese patent) are slanted in an anticlockwise direction with respect to the roller axis.

In this connection, Applicant further desires to point out that the clockwise slanted arrangement of the seats of Applicant's cylindric ring element is clearly shown in the drawings and is also described in the present amendment.

With respect to the words of new claim 6 "said inclination being such that each said band element has a length larger by substantially 25% than a length that a vertical like band element would have

if it would be arranged in a direction parallel to said vertical axis of said cylindric ring body", these words are fully supported by Applicant disclosure, as pointed out above. These words further limit new claim 6.

A further aspect to be considered in comparing Applicant's new claim 6 with the disclosure of the Japanese patent, is that the Japanese patent provides an integral roller, that is a roller which is not made by overlapping "modular" ring elements, which has been specifically designed for reducing operation noise.


The Japanese patent document does not provide the advantages disclosed in the present application, but is merely a washing brush that operates with less noise.

With respect to new claim 7, it is respectfully submitted that it is novel and inventive over the combination of the Japanese patent and DE 201 14 359 U1 (the German patent), which teaches a car brush having adjoining strips of band elements that have different colors. The German patent does not disclose the concept of providing different colors on the different band elements, i.e. on the strips of the band elements.

For these reasons, it is requested that all grounds of rejection be withdrawn in view of the foregoing discussion.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted

  
James V. Costigan  
Registration No. 25,669

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 302-8989

JUN 11 2009

IN THE DRAWINGS

Kindly cancel the original drawings and insert the  
attached replacement sheets.